1 2 3	F. TRAVIS BUCHANAN, ESQ., & ASSOCIATES, PLLC F. TRAVIS BUCHANAN, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 9371 701 East Bridger Ave., Suite 540 Las Vegas Nevada 89101	
4 5	Tel: (702) 331-5478 Fax: (702) 629-6919 Attorneys for Plaintiff KAREN MCDONNELL	
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA F	
8	KAREN MCDONNELL, an individual,	Case No. 2:22-cv-00425-JCM-VC\footnote{W}
9	Plaintiff,	
10	vs.	STIPULATION TO EXTEND DISCOVERY DEADLINES
11	CLARK COUNTY; DOES 1-10, and ROE ENTITIES 1-10, inclusive,	(THIRD REQUEST)
12	inclusive,	(THIRD REQUEST)
13	Defendant.	
14 15	Plaintiff KAREN MCDONNELL ("Plaintiff"), by and through her counsel F. Travis	
16	Buchanan, Esq. & Assoc., PLLC, and Defendant CLARK COUNTY ("Defendant"), through their	
17	counsel Stephanie A. Mazzei, hereby stipulate and agree to extend the discovery remaining and	
18	related deadlines for thirty (30) days.	
19	This Stipulation is submitted and based upon the following:	
20	A. Discovery Completed to Date.	
21	To date, the Parties have exchanged initial and supplemental disclosures of documents and	
22	witnesses pursuant to FRCP 26(a)(1). Plaintiff has propounded written discovery including	
23	interrogatories, requests for production, and requests for admission, and Defendant has served	
24	responses to Plaintiff's written discovery requests. Defendant has propounded written discovery	
25 26	including interrogatories, requests for production, and requests for admission upon Plaintiff and	
	Plaintiff has served responses to Defendant's written discovery requests. Plaintiff KAREN	

MCDONNELL's Deposition was convened on April 26, 2023, and due to the limited availability

² The 30th day fell on Saturday July 8, 2023.

of Witness, Clark County Manager - Kevin Schiller, the parties have agreed to convene and hold his Deposition on May 31, 2023, which is the first date he is available in light of his current, busy schedule (which is after the current discovery cut-off date). The Parties have also agreed to resume settlement discussions in the interim, and it is possible that this matter could settle within the timeperiod of the instant stipulated extension.

B. Discovery Which Still Needs to Occur.

At this time Plaintiff only intends to depose Clark County Manager – Kevin Schiller, a percipient witness.

C. Proposed Schedule for Completing Remaining Discovery.

Discovery Cut-Off Date – The May 8, 2023, discovery cut-off date shall be extended to June 7, 2023, to allow for the Deposition of Clark County Manager – Kevin Schiller.

Dispositive Motions – The current June 8, 2023, dispositive motions deadline shall be extended to July 10, 2023.²

Pretrial Order – If no dispositive motions are filed, the Joint Pretrial Order shall be filed on August 9, 2023

thirty (30) days after the date set for the filing of the dispositive motions. In the event dispositive motions are filed, the date for filing the Joint Pretrial Order shall be suspended until thirty (30) days after the decision on the dipositive motions or by further order of the Court.

D. Good Cause Supports this Request.

soonest (5/31/23), which is the soonest date for which he is available for Deposition.

When a stipulation requires the modification of the scheduling order, the parties must first satisfy the "good cause" standard established by Rule 16(b). *See Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 608 (9th Cir. 1992); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4) ("A schedule may be modified only for good cause and with the judge's consent"). The good cause inquiry is focused on the movant's reasons for seeking to modify the scheduling order and primarily considers the

¹ After discussing Mr. Schiller's schedule, near-term commitments, conflicts and availability for deposition over the past several weeks, On 5/2/23, Plaintiff served Defendant Clark County with Notice of Kevin Schiller's Deposition on for the

movant's diligence. *In re W. States Wholesale Nat. Gas Antitrust Litig.*, 715 F.3d 716, 737 (9th Cir. 2013). The key determination is whether the subject deadline "cannot reasonably be met despite the diligence of the party seeking the extension." *Johnson*, 975 F.2d at 609. The Court considers whether relief from the scheduling order is sought based on the development of matters that could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time the schedule was established. *Jackson v. Laureate, Inc.*, 186 F.R.D. 605, 608 (E.D. Cal. 1999). Courts may also consider other pertinent circumstances, including whether the movant was diligent in seeking modification of the scheduling order once it became apparent that the movant required relief from the deadline at issue. *Sharp v. Covenant Care LLC*, 288 F.R.D. 465, 467 (S.D. Cal. 2012). "The diligence obligation is ongoing" such that parties must "diligently attempt to adhere to [the deadlines in the scheduling order] throughout the subsequent course of the litigation."

Here, good cause exists to extend the discovery schedule as requested herein. The parties

Here, good cause exists to extend the discovery schedule as requested herein. The parties have acted in good faith to comply with the discovery deadlines and resolve any discovery disputes. Further, the parties remain open to engaging in settlement negotiations in an attempt to resolve this matter. The parties remain optimistic that they may be able to resolve this matter. Accordingly, the parties have agreed to extend the discovery deadlines to allow for the Deposition of Clark County Manager – Kevin Schiller, as well as to allow further settlement negotiations before incurring additional expenses.

21 | | / / /

22 ||//

 $\begin{bmatrix} 23 \\ 24 \end{bmatrix}$

25 || / /

26 ||//

27 ||//

28

Case 2:22-cv-00425-JCM-VCF Document 27 Filed 05/08/23 Page 4 of 4